

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed October 6, 2009 was received and carefully reviewed.

Claims 1, 3-22, 24-34, 37, 38, and 40-60 were pending in the present application prior to this response. Presently, claims 1, 4, 9, 10, 12, 19, 20, 22, 31, 34, and 38 are hereby amended to clarify the invention, and not for reason of patentability. Claims 5-8, 13-18 and 24-28 remain withdrawn for being directed to a non-elected invention. Claims 2, 23, 32, 35-36, and 39 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in a previous response. No new claims have been added, and no claims have been canceled by way of this response. Therefore, claims 1, 3-22, 24-34, 37, 38, and 40-60 remain pending in the subject application.

Support for the amendment to independent claims 1, 9, and 19 can be found in Embodiment 1 in the application as originally filed. Accordingly, Applicant contends that no new matter has been introduced by the amendment to claims 1, 9, and 19.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of all currently pending rejections is hereby requested in view of the reasons set forth below.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 9-12, 19-22, 33, 34, 37, 38, and 40-60 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kawase et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No.: 2002/0067400 A1) (*Kawase*, hereinafter) in view of Yamazaki (EP 1 071 117 A2) (*Yamazaki*, hereinafter), Muehlberger (U.S. Patent No.: 5,679,167) (*Muehlberger* '167), and Muehlberger et al. (U.S. Patent No.: 4,328,257) (*Muehlberger* '257). Applicant traverses the rejection for at least the reasons set forth below.

The present independent claims 1, 9 and 19, and the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinguishable over *Kawase*, *Yamazaki*, *Muehlberger* '167 and *Muehlberger* '257, either taken alone or in combination, since these references fail to disclose, teach or suggest all the features recited in the pending claims. For example, independent claim 1 (emphasis added) is directed to a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus including, *inter alia*, the features of:

“...a first chamber for performing a plasma treatment on a first part of an object by the plasma therein under atmospheric pressure or approximate to atmospheric pressure...an ink-jet device for applying a droplet to a second part of the object simultaneously with performing the plasma treatment...wherein the object is level transferred in the first chamber along a first direction and the plasma generating device is moved in the first chamber along the rail and along a second direction intersecting with the first direction and in a direction parallel to a side of the object.”

Independent claim 9 (emphasis added) is directed to a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus including, *inter alia*, the features of:

“...a first chamber for performing a plasma treatment on a first part of an object by the plasma therein under atmospheric pressure or approximate to atmospheric pressure...an ink-jet device for applying a droplet to a second part of the object simultaneously with performing the first plasma treatment...wherein the object is level transferred in the first chamber, the second chamber and the third chamber along a first direction and the first plasma generating device is moved in the first chamber along a second direction intersecting with the first direction and in a direction parallel to a side of the object.”

Independent claim 19 (emphasis added) is directed to a semiconductor manufacturing apparatus including, *inter alia*, the features of:

“...a first chamber for performing a plasma treatment on a first part of an object by the plasma therein under

atmospheric pressure or approximate to atmospheric pressure...at least one ink-jet device for applying a droplet to a second part of the object simultaneously with performing the plasma treatment...wherein the object is level transferred in the first chamber along a first direction and the plasma generating device is moved in the first chamber along the rail and along a second direction intersecting with the first direction and in a direction parallel to a side of the object..."

Applicant contends that *Kawase*, *Yamazaki*, *Muehlberger* '167 and *Muehlberger* '257, taken either alone or in combination, fail to anticipate or render obvious at least the above-mentioned features with respect to present independent claims 1, 9, and 19.

Kawase appears to disclose an inkjet apparatus having an inkjet head 22, a head position controller 17 for controlling the position of the inkjet head 22, and a substrate position controller 18 for controlling the position of the mother substrate 12 (see *Kawase*, e.g., FIG. 8 and paragraph [0072]). *Kawase* merely seems to disclose that the mother substrate 12 may be scanned in a Y direction, as conventionally known in the art (see *Kawase*, e.g., FIG. 9 and paragraph [0082]), but remains completely silent with regard to the mother substrate 12 being level transferred in the first chamber 14.

Yamazaki, upon whom the Examiner is reliant for teaching a plurality of processing chambers, appears to disclose a plurality of processing chambers, for processing a substrate 104, that are connected to a common chamber 103 (see *Yamazaki*, e.g., FIG. 1 and the Abstract). *Yamazaki* also appears to disclose an oxidation chamber 107, a solution application chamber 108, a baking chamber 109, and a vapor-phase film formation chamber 110, 111 (see *Yamazaki*, e.g., FIG. 1 and the Abstract). However, *Yamazaki* seems to fail to disclose, teach, or suggest that the substrate 104 is level transferred in any of the processing chambers.

Moreover, neither *Muehlberger* '167 nor *Muehlberger* '257 make up for the above-recited deficiencies with respect to *Kawase* and *Yamazaki*. Consequently, neither *Kawase*, *Yamazaki*,

Muehlberger '167 nor *Muehlberger* '257, either taken alone or in combination, anticipate or render obvious each and every feature recited in present independent claims 1, 9, and 19.

For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has failed to set forth a proper *prima facie* case of obviousness in rejecting independent claims 1, 9, and 19. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn, and that independent claims 1, 9, and 19 receive allowance.

Claims 3, 4, 10-12, 20-22, 33, 34, 37, 38, and 40-60 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from one of the independent claims, but also because they are distinguishable over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of the rejection, and the allowance of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested. If, however, the Examiner deems that any issue remains after considering this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney to expedite the prosecution and engage in a joint effort to work out a mutually satisfactory solution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2380. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON PEABODY LLP

Date: January 6, 2010

/Anthony J. Canning Reg. #62,107/
Anthony J. Canning